DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 118 879 CE 006 435

AUTHOR Bishop, Edward W.
TITLE Police Management Training Factors Influencing DWI Arrests. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Dunlap and Associates, Inc., Darien, Conn.
SPONS AGENCY National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (DOT), Washington, D. C.
REPORT NO DOT-HS-801-731
PUB DATE Sep 75
NOTE 73p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Personnel; Course Content; Course Evaluation; Decision Making; *Drinking; Instructional Materials; Job Training; *Law Enforcement; *Material Development; Performance Factors; *Police; Program Development; Program Evaluation; Workshops
IDENTIFIERS *Driving While Intoxicated

ABSTRACT

The development of training material for police management personnel concerning command and supervisory actions appropriate for more effective driving-while-intoxicated (DWI) enforcement is desired. The training is based on two research studies that identified environmental and attitudinal factors influencing a patrolman's arrest decision. These factors are summarized in tabular form and discussed. The training program design is a workshop using the case-study technique. The following steps in the development of training content and format are desired: compilation of training requirements, selection of training objectives and strategy, design of materials, pilot tests, evaluation and revision of materials, and production of final copies. Results of three pilot tests of the training package and participant evaluations are presented, which indicate that (1) the training package developed by the project presented a necessary and interesting topic and (2) the format and manner of presentation were judged as adequate or better. Recommendations were that the materials be produced for dissemination and that continuing evaluation of workshops be maintained. Appended material (41 pages) includes: task descriptions from the project plan, final version of the workshop schedule, evaluation plan and instruments, and memorandum reports of pilot tests. (Author/HS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED118879

47-61

DOT HS-801 731

CE

POLICE MANAGEMENT TRAINING FACTORS INFLUENCING DWI ARRESTS

Contract No. DOT-HS-4-00987
September 1975
Final Report

PREPARED FOR:
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

CE006435

Document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

This document is disseminated under the sponsorship of the Department of Transportation in the interest of information exchange. The United States Government assumes no liability for its contents or use thereof.

Technical Report Documentation Page

1. Report No.	2. Government Accession No.	3. Recipient's Catalog No.
DOT HS-801 731		

4. Title and Subtitle	5. Report Date
Police Management Training Factors Influencing DWI Arrests Final Technical Report	September 1975
	6. Performing Organization Code
7. Author(s)	8. Performing Organization Report No.
Edward W. Bishop	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address	10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS)
Dunlap and Associates, Inc. 1 Parkland Drive Darien, Connecticut 06820	11. Contract or Grant No. DOT-HS-4-00987
	13. Type of Report and Period Covered 6-1974-5-1975 Final Technical
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address U.S. Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration 400 Seventh Street, S.W. Washington, D.C. 20590	14. Sponsoring Agency Code

15. Supplementary Notes

Pages 44-45 appear back-to-back as one form and are on 8-1/2" x 14" sheets.

16. Abstract

The development of training material for police management personnel concerning command and supervisory actions appropriate for more effective DWI enforcement is described. The training is based on two research studies that identified environmental and attitudinal factors that influence a patrolman's arrest decision. The training is designed as a workshop and uses the case-study technique. The development of both content and format is described as well as the results of pilot test and evaluation.

17. Key Words	18. Distribution Statement
police management training command and supervision DWI	Document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service, Springfield Virginia 22161

19. Security Classif. (of this report)	20. Security Classif. (of this page)	21. No. of Pages	22. Price
Unclassified	Unclassified	71	

Form DOT F 1700.7 (8-72) Reproduction of completed page authorized

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	STUDY APPROACH	1
II.	STUDY RESULTS	3
	A. Training Requirements	3
	B. Training Objectives	8
	1. Policy	8
	2. Operations	9
	3. Training	10
	4. Communication	11
	C. Training Strategy	12
	D. Test and Evaluation	13
III.	CONCLUSIONS	20
APPENDIX A.	Task Descriptions from the Project Plan	21
APPENDIX B.	Workshop Schedule	29
APPENDIX C.	Evaluation Plan	37
APPENDIX D.	Memorandum Reports of Pilot Tests by Connecticut Municipal Police Training Council; New Hampshire Police Standards and Training Council; Traffic Institute, Northwestern University	51

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The police management training material was developed for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration by Dunlap and Associates, Inc., of Darien, Connecticut. Mr. Edward W. Bishop of the Dunlap staff was the author. However, there are many persons who contributed directly or who gave guidance that helped shape the format and content of this training package; their assistance and support are gratefully acknowledged.

- Mr. Cecil B. Arnold was the NHTSA Contract Technical Manager and provided able direction and advice from the conceptual stage through the final production. His help in evaluating the trial presentations of this training was especially valuable.

- Mr. Richard R. Frederick, of NHTSA, was the Technical Specialist and provided a unique contribution. His police experience both as an officer and an instructor helped greatly to make this a practical and workable training package. His special concern for the DWI problem helped to make clear the specific objectives to be addressed.

- Mr. John F. Oates, Jr., of the Dunlap staff and Mr. Floyd H. Holmes of Arthur Young & Co., Washington, D.C., were consultants to this program. These men were the principal investigators in the two survey studies on which this training is based. Their thorough knowledge of those studies facilitated the translation to a training package. They also provided capable support in the trial presentations.

- This training package was put through three trial presentations during its development, and the people who helped arrange and conduct these presentations gave invaluable support in their critical reviews and practical advice. These people are listed below:

Connecticut Municipal Police Training Council

Richard M. Hannon, Executive Director
Frederic C. Morton, Instructor

New Hampshire Police Standards and Training Council

Arthur D. Kehas, Director
Earl M Sweeney, Field Representative
Clarence Jeffery, Instructor (N.H. Program on Drug and Alcohol Abuse)

Northwestern University, Traffic Institute

Russell J. Arend, Director of Training
Richard E. Stephens, Instructor
Stephen S. Caruso, Instructor

Finally, the assistance of the Dunlap staff in the preparation of this package must be acknowledged. In particular, the craftsmanship and careful attention to detail brought to this program by Miss Frances Kowaleski have helped produce an accurate, highly usable training package.

FOREWORD

The threat posed by the drinking driver to the lives and property of others, as well as to himself, continues at a tragically high rate. This rate is intolerable; alcohol-related automobile crashes must be reduced. The Department of Transportation (DOT) is carrying out a multifaceted integrated program to achieve such a reduction.

Among the several projects supported by DOT were two studies of the factors that influence a police officer's discretion in the enforcement of driving-while-intoxicated (DWI) laws. In the chain of events, from detecting a DWI suspect until the suspect is arrested, cited, or released, there are decision points at which the investigating officer can elect to proceed with a DWI arrest or to arrest or cite the suspect on a lesser charge, or to release the suspect. The two studies sampled a wide range of police organizations and, using survey as well as interview techniques, identified several factors which do influence the police officer's decision (either positively or negatively) to make an arrest. One of these studies was confined to jurisdictions in which Alcohol Safety Action Programs (ASAP) had been established, and the second study was concerned with non-ASAP areas.

The development of management training material based on these two studies is a logical step in creating and cultivating a management climate that will encourage DWI enforcement. This report describes the development of a police management training package about factors influencing DWI arrest decisions. The goal of this training package is to acquaint police managers with the factors and to help them identify command and supervisory actions that should be taken. In behavioral terms, upon completion of this training the student will be able to identify and implement management actions appropriate for increasing DWI enforcement in his own community. This training is not intended simply to transmit knowledge; it is intended to produce changes in the student's job performance.

The emphasis on management actions appropriate to a given community is important. It was found that the factors affecting the DWI arrest decision are not the same in all communities. Also, a manager's actions in response to a given factor must be designed with the needs and characteristics of his community in mind. Because of the importance of developing unique management actions, this training has been designed in a workshop format which requires active student involvement and affords the student practice in evaluating and applying the studies' results.

I. STUDY APPROACH

The study reported here was a training materials development project that in concept is identical to each of the very large number of such projects sponsored by NHTSA in recent years. There is, however, one important difference between this training and that developed in most of the other studies, which affected the way in which the present project was carried out. The difference is that most of the training projects are vocational in nature; the present one is focused on presenting information and modifying behavior. In educational terms, the vocational training attempts to impart skills and knowledge while this training attempts to impart knowledge and to modify (or create) attitudes. What this meant for the development approach was that it was not necessary to define a job and analyze it into requisite skills and knowledge. The knowledge to be imparted had already been defined in two earlier studies of the factors that influence a patrolman's decision in a DWI arrest.* The desired management actions and attitudes--to overcome negative influences or to encourage positive ones--are inherent in the factors, themselves.

Thus, the steps that were accomplished in this study were:

- Compile the training requirements from the results of the two studies.
- Derive training objectives.
- Select a training strategy.
- Design training materials.
- Conduct realistic pilot tests.
- Evaluate the materials.

---

*Factors Influencing Arrests for Alcohol-related Traffic Violations, Final Report. Prepared by Dunlap and Associates, Inc., Darien, Connecticut 06820, for the U.S. Department of Transportation, NHTSA, September 1974 (available from NTIS, #PB-237004).
Factors Influencing Alcohol Safety Action Project Police Officers' DWI Arrests, Final Report. Prepared by Arthur Young & Company, Washington, D.C. 20036, for the U.S. Department of Transportation, NHTSA, 29 April 1974 (available from NTIS, #PB-232538).

- Revise materials.

- Produce final copies.

The specific tasks that were undertaken are described in the Project Plan contained in Appendix A.

II. STUDY RESULTS

The training materials produced by this project are the ultimate product or "result." There are, however, intermediate results that are also of interest, particularly as they illuminate the technical approach. These will be described in this section; there are four groups of such results:

- Training requirements
- Instructional objectives
- Training strategy
- Test and evaluation

A. Training Requirements

As indicated earlier, the development of training requirements was essentially a process of compiling information from the two studies. These studies were done under different circumstances by independent research teams; yet the results of both studies are closely parallel. This is especially evident in the summaries of the factors that each uncovered. Table I is in two parts that summarize the factors from each study. The similarities are obvious.

The recommended actions were likewise virtually identical between the two studies. Several specific recommendations for actions to enhance alcohol-related enforcement were developed in each study. The actions are ones which must be taken by command or supervisory personnel to reinforce those attitudes and factors that will enhance enforcement and to counteract those attitudes and factors that tend to reduce enforcement. It would serve no practical purpose to enumerate all of the recommendations in this Technical Report.* Rather, the recommendations are summarized into the four areas of management responsibility that encompass all of the recommendations. These constitute the training requirements. In other words, it is required to train police managers in the factors and recommended actions that relate to their responsibilities for Policy, Operations, Training and Communication.

Each recommendation has been identified with the responsibility for which it has the greatest impact. Obviously, any action by police management personnel relates in some measure to all four areas. A training

*The interested reader should refer to either the training material developed in this project or to the reports of the earlier studies cited on Page 1.

Table I(a).

Factors Influencing the Alcohol-Related Arrest Decision,
Non-ASAP Areas
(table adapted from the study report)

A. Factors Relating to the Officer's Background

- The officer's age and experience.
- His personal use of alcohol.
- His awareness of the relationship between alcohol and intoxication.
- The extent of training he has received for A/R enforcement.
- His duty assignment, in particular his assignment relative to traffic law enforcement.
- His educational status.

B. Factors Relating to the Officer's General Attitude toward A/R Violations

- The officer's perception of the A/R problem.
- His attitude toward A/R offenders.
- His perception of the suitability of A/R penalties.
- His attitude toward alternatives to A/R arrest.

C. Factors Specific to a Given Incident

- The time of day, and time remaining in the duty tour.
- The suspect's degree of intoxication.
- The weather conditions.
- The suspect's attitude.
- The suspect's age, sex, and race.
- Accident involvement in the incident.
- Involvement of other traffic violations in the incident.
- The suspect's position in the community.

D. Factors Relating to the Local Environment

- Court disposition of A/R cases.
- Departmental policy concerning A/R enforcement.
- The magnitude of other law enforcement problems encountered.
- A/R arrest processing procedures.

Table I(b).

Factors Influencing the Alcohol-Related Arrest Decision, ASAP Areas

(table adapted from the study report)

A. Personal Factors
- Officer's age and experience
- Officer's drinking habits (18%)
- Attitude toward drunk drivers (60%)
- Attitude toward punishment of DWI violators (27%)
- Attitude toward deterrent value of enforcement (61%)
- Extent and nature of DWI training
- Attitude toward specialized DWI enforcement (59%)
- Experience in traffic accident investigation (75%)
- Officer's self-confidence

B. Driver-Related Factors
- Attitude of driver (55%)
- Political or social status of the driver (27%)
- The suspect's age
- The suspect's sex (19%)
- The nature of the suspect's drinking problem (34%)
- Presence of a sober licensed driver in the car (45%)
- The nearness of the driver's residence (38%)
- The suspect's "story" or rationale for intoxication

C. Operational Factors
- The nature of the suspect's driving (78%)
- The degree of intoxication (65%)
- The time required to process DWI arrests (26%)
- The nature of DWI processing procedures (32%)
- The fact the officer made a prior DWI arrest in the duty shift
- The time remaining in the officer's duty shift (33%)
- The frequency of court appearances (21%)
- The effect of unusual working hours
- The use of one- or two-man patrol cars
- The area to which the officer is assigned
- The patrol techniques used by the officer
- The voluntary nature of assignment to specialized patrol
- Competition between officers
- The relationship of the officer to special program administrators
- The nature of available equipment and facilities
- The nature of community social conditions

D. Departmental Factors
- The level of officer morale (55%)
- The attitude of other officers (18%)
- The existence of performance standards
- The policy of the officer's supervisor
- The policy of the department
- The nature of the police agency
- The quality of the officer's supervisor
- The feeling of isolation from the remainder of the department

E. Outside Influences
- Court support for DWI enforcement (37%)
- The officer's faith in court justice (21%)
- The support of the local prosecutor (30%)
- Community attitudes and support (29%)
- The legality of specialized programs
- The weather conditions

effort, for example, must be supported by a policy commitment and any management action must be communicated to the whole department. Thus, the following summaries of recommended actions are grouped to show emphasis rather than absolute categorization:

- Policy

  In general, there appears to be a poor enunciation of the department's position concerning alcohol-related enforcement. The ASAP programs each have specific, defined objectives. However, even in departments having an ASAP program, a lack of an alcohol-related policy was noted. Essentially, the need is for a policy that is formalized and unambiguously stated. In particular, two deficiencies were cited: the lack of a priority for alcohol-related enforcement, and the lack of specific parameters of enforcement performance. The officers generally expressed a desire for a forthright statement of policy, eliminating the need as well as the opportunity for interpretation by supervisory personnel.

- Operations

  Within the operation of alcohol-related enforcement programs, there are several factors that influence, to a greater or lesser degree, the patrolman's decision to make an alcohol-related arrest. Some of the factors identified in the policy area relate quite directly to this "operations" area as well. For example, the officer's concern for performance standards and need for clear communication from management and supervisory personnel directly affect actions that can be taken in alcohol-related enforcement. In this area there is concern about time-consuming processing procedures and courtroom appearances. In addition, the latter are often viewed as exercises in futility because of the possibility for reduced charges and sentencing for the alcohol-related violation; also, court procedures frequently are such as to require several appearances because of delays and continuances. Specialized assignments to alcohol-related enforcement appear to be a positive factor and duty-hours, whatever the assignment, can be arranged to help maximize enforcement. Overall, the actions to be taken in this area are ones that will reflect the department's priority for alcohol-related enforcement and communicate to the patrolman the importance of effective enforcement.

Training

The results of the studies indicate a widespread need for training in alcohol-related enforcement as well as in the basics of alcohol, intoxication and the nature and scope of the alcohol-related offense problem. The need for training in varying degrees extends throughout the whole police structure. There was identified a need for training at the command and supervisory levels, as well as at the patrolman level. There is a need for training patrolmen in overall knowledge of alcohol-related traffic violations, as well as in knowledge of special techniques of detection and investigation. Specialized training in the operation of breath-testing devices is a positive factor. The obvious recommendation to command and supervisory personnel is to provide such training. In addition, command and supervisory personnel have a responsibility for training at their levels, particularly with regard to the scope and nature of the alcohol-related enforcement problem. (This workshop is one part of the necessary command and supervisory training. It identifies specific actions to be taken by command and supervisory personnel, some of which may require even further training. For example, this workshop identifies the need for effective communication of department policy and objectives; in order for supervisory personnel to carry out this action, further specialized training may be appropriate.)

Communication

This area is an extremely broad one. As has been noted in the areas of policy and operations, there is a need for effective communication within the department. There is, in addition, a need for the police organization to be in effective communication with the judicial system and with the community it serves. The judicial system, as a partner in the alcohol-related enforcement and adjudication process, is frequently cited as a factor in the officer's decision. Time required for court appearances, the delays and continuances and frequently the failure to convict all determine to some degree whether or not the officer will make an alcohol-related arrest. The need for communication is clear. Communication of the department's policy and objectives to the judicial system is essential for smooth and effective operation of the partnership. Similarly, the patrolman needs to acquire an understanding of the problems of alcohol-related adjudication, particularly the difficulties associated with establishing and supporting the evidentiary structure and the effects of possible penalties

and rehabilitation programs. The factors that were identified in this area had to do with the process of communication, as well as with the need for specific lines of communication.

The recommended actions are so significantly related to all four management responsibilities that the whole development program was organized around them. In the next section, the training requirements are translated into specific training objectives in each responsibility area.

B. Training Objectives

The development of objectives was a process of translation in which each recommended action was examined to determine what specific skills, knowledge and attitudes were needed to carry out the action. It then became an objective of this project to train each skill and knowledge and to develop appropriate attitudes. These objectives are listed below, organized under the four management responsibility headings.

1. Policy

What is of concern here is the role of police command and supervisory personnel in the development and implementation of departmental policy. Obviously, the policy of a given department is not the sole prerogative of police management. Policy is developed and imposed by the governing political body, but police management does have a strong, direct influence on policy development. More directly, police management affects policy by the way in which it is implemented and reflected in the operations of the department. Typically, policy statements offer a wide latitude to the administrators and supervisors in carrying out the intent. Management's perception of policy, including the relative importance of alcohol-related offenses, is reflected in the way in which a department is organized and staffed, as well as the way in which day-to-day operations are conducted.

The study results indicate that either there is no formal policy concerning alcohol-related offenses or that, if it does exist, it is reflected in the implementation in a way that, at best, gives the officers little or no guidance as to the importance of alcohol-related enforcement and, at worst, may encourage them to conclude that alcohol-related enforcement is of relatively low priority. A formal, explicit policy is a critical necessity for effective alcohol-related enforcement, and the department's commitment to this policy must be reflected in the implementation by administrators and supervisors.

The specific objectives of this workshop that evolve from these policy-related requirements are intended to identify and help develop the following knowledges and skills:

a. Knowledge of adequate and effective alcohol-related policy, both general (theoretical) and department-specific.

b. The ability to formulate an adequate and effective policy concerning alcohol-related offenses specific to one's own department.

c. Knowledge of techniques of effective implementation and communication of policy.

d. Knowledge of alcohol-related management information systems.

e. The ability to use such systems to evaluate and adapt policy.

2. Operations

This broad area of management responsibility encompasses the day-to-day operation of the department and is for alcohol-related offenses particularly concerned with procedures, standards of performance and intradepartmental communication.

The study results indicate that first and foremost the operation of the department must reflect the priority which it assigns to alcohol-related offenses. The operation of the department must also facilitate alcohol-related enforcement, specifically with regard to the processing procedures (and time required) for DWI arrests. The use of specialized assignments and the establishment of duty hours should also reflect an awareness of the influences affecting alcohol-related arrests, as well as the department's concern for this enforcement.

The specific objectives in this area are concerned with producing the knowledges and skills listed below.

a. Knowledge of effective alcohol-related enforcement plans and procedures.

b. Ability to design operational plans to enhance alcohol-related enforcement, including specialized assignment and duty hours as well as specific procedures and permance standards.

c. Ability to communicate operational plans and procedures effectively.

d. Knowledge of alcohol-related management information systems.

e. Ability to develop and use alcohol-related management information systems for operations control and evaluation.

3. Training

This area includes responsibility for training at all levels within the department and training in all aspects, including technical, administrative and background. This responsibility includes command and supervisory training as well as training of line personnel.

The fact that the patrolman does have the opportunity to exercise discretion in an alcohol-related arrest and the further fact that some of the factors that influence his discretion have not been readily apparent lead to the basic requirement for training. That requirement is, of course, for police personnel at all levels to be aware of the factors influencing alcohol-related arrests and, further, to be aware of the consequences of these influences on their job whether at the patrolman or higher level. In addition, the results indicate a need for specific training with regard to alcohol and intoxication, the impact of alcohol-related offenses on highway safety, and of special techniques for alcohol-related detection and investigation, including the operation of breath-testing devices. In general, the study results indicate a direct, positive relationship between the amount of specialized alcohol-related training and the level of alcohol-related enforcement.

Specific workshop objectives in this area are concerned with the knowledges and skills listed below:

a. Knowledge of the nature and effect of excessive drinking.

b. Knowledge of the importance of alcohol-related offenses, both generally (national highway safety) and within one's own department or jurisdiction.

c. Knowledge of police role in alcohol-related enforcement.

d. Knowledge of the factors that influence a patrolman's alcohol-related arrest decision.

e. Knowledge of the effects of these factors on each level in the department (officer, supervisor, and commander).

f. Knowledge of specific programs or actions that will reinforce or will counteract these factors to enhance alcohol-related enforcement.

g. Knowledge of specific alcohol-related training needs.

h. The ability to provide effective training with regard to the factors, effects and remedial programs.

i. The ability to evaluate training effectiveness with regard to alcohol-related enforcement.

4. Communication

The management responsibility that is of concern here includes communication within the department as well as interaction between the department and other community organizations, including the general public. Of special interest to alcohol-related offenses is the interaction between the police department and the judicial organization.

Communication is an extremely broad term that denotes a process applied to many activities. The study results indicate that the process of communication can result in incomplete information, and thus poor understanding, and in some cases the process can actually affect the content of the information. An example of the former is the apparent lack of understanding or appreciation of court disposition of alcohol-related cases. The latter problem is illustrated by the apparent effect of supervisors' attitudes on policy statements.

The studies indicate that the officers' decision about an alcohol-related arrest is strongly affected by the disposition that is typically made of alcohol-related arrests. Specifically, it was reported that there is a generally negative effect on the arrest decision as a consequence of the fact that DWI arrests often result in negotiations; often as many as 25% of the arrested suspects are not convicted on the alcohol-related charge. Also indicated in the results, with regard to community relations, is the need for police officials to be able to obtain public support for alcohol-related enforcement and to assure that there is equitable enforcement for all citizens. Police administrators and supervisors, therefore, are required to interact with these segments of the total community in a way that gives the police officer apparent support for his enforcement activities and develops community support of alcohol-related

enforcement based on the significance of alcohol-related offenses, as well as a concept of reasonable and equal adjudication.

The objectives for this workshop that arise from this area relate to the knowledges and skills listed below:

a. Knowledge of effective supervisory communication techniques.

b. Knowledge of communication techniques appropriate to the several segments of the community.

c. The ability to identify communication needs and problems.

d. The ability to establish and maintain effective channels of communication to all segments of the community concerning the effect of alcohol-related offenses and the need for effective enforcement and adjudication.

C. Training Strategy

The process of selecting an appropriate training strategy is not purely either analytical or inductive. The process consists of identifying the requirements for training method, as well as the constraints that are inherent in the content of the training, the training objectives, the circumstances under which the training is to be given, and the audience to which the training is addressed. The requirements and constraints that were judged to be particularly relevant to the selection of a training strategy are listed below in an approximate order of importance:

1. Taken altogether, the training objectives can be described as ones that will lead to changes in content-specific attitudes and related actions.

2. The actions cannot be prescribed (or taught) in specific detail for all students. The recommended general action must be made specific by each student to his own community and departmental needs.

3. Since the audience for this training includes all levels of command and supervision, it can be expected that any given presentation will include persons of widely different backgrounds.

4. Because the training is addressed to command and supervisory personnel, there will in general be only a limited amount of time they can spend in training.

Considering all of the above, it was concluded that the most effective training strategy would be based on a small group instruction that is brief, yet intensive, and involves the students as directly and actively as possible. The workshop that has evolved includes instructor presentation of the content of the two earlier studies, the opportunity for discussion and evaluation of the results by the students, and the application of the recommendations in a realistic case study. Based on experience in other alcohol-related training, a controlled drinking demonstration was included in the workshop. Finally, the workshop was designed with the possibility for modification into a more extensive course and one that might be given as part of a college-level program. The possibilities for this expansion are discussed in the training material. This allows training administrators the opportunity of modifying this workshop (if the local situation suggests such a course). The design of the workshop, as presented in the training materials, is best illustrated by the schedule contained in Appendix B which includes a brief description of each unit in the workshop.

Training strategy can also be construed to include the requirements placed on the instructor. As is the case with virtually all of the NHTSA-sponsored training, the basic premise is that the training can be delivered by any qualified police instructor. There is, of course, the requirement for specific preparation in the content of the training, but the desired goal is to produce training that can be used by any interested jurisdiction or training facility. There are, however, some characteristics of small group instruction that do make special demands of the instructor. Essentially these demands are that the instructor be able to control and direct the discussion and participation of a small group, particularly in the application of the case study solution. These requirements are described in the training material, and there is guidance to help the instructor fulfill the special demands. The strategy that has been selected does make demands of the instructor, but they are demands that can be met by police instructors, as was demonstrated during the pilot test of the training material.

D. Test and Evaluation

The objectives of test and evaluation for this project were to assess the adequacy of the scope and coverage of the material and to evaluate the effectiveness of the delivery as it is affected by the design of the training package. To meet these objectives, it was necessary that the conditions of the pilot test faithfully simulate the conditions anticipated for actual use of the completed training package. Also, it was necessary that the data collection procedures be designed so that appropriate information is collected in a form that will be useful for subsequent evaluation. The plan for evaluation of this project is reproduced in Appendix C, along with the data collection forms that were used by the Workshop Leader, the observers and the participants.

Several potential pilot test sites were canvassed by the contractor, and even though the original plan called for only one such test, it was found that two could be accommodated and the Municipal Police Training Councils in Connecticut and New Hampshire were selected as the pilot test sites. A combination of circumstances prevented the designated instructor from conducting the Connecticut test. That test, therefore, was conducted by contractor personnel and was not considered a truly representative presentation. The New Hampshire test was conducted by State personnel, using their regularly available facilities and resources with virtually no assistance from the contractor. It was, therefore, considered to be a highly realistic simulation of actual training. The results of these two tests are described in the first Memorandum Report contained in Appendix D.

Following the New Hampshire test, it was decided that a pilot test presented to members of urban departments might provide information that was different from that generated in the New Hampshire test attended by members of relatively small departments in a very active ASAP state. Arrangements were then completed for the workshop to be conducted by the Traffic Institute of Northwestern University. As in the case of the test at New Hampshire, the Traffic Institute test was carried out by Institute personnel, with no contractor or other outside help. The results of that last pilot test are contained in the second memorandum in Appendix D.

The persons who took part in each of the pilot tests--leaders and participants--are listed in Table II. Their assistance is gratefully acknowledged.

The major finding at each of the three tests was that the leaders, the observers and the participants almost unanimously felt that the original schedule of 2-1/2 days did not allow enough time for adequate presentation. Therefore, the major result of test and evaluation was that the workshop was reformatted to a full 3-day schedule (which is the one shown in Appendix B). There were several editorial and organizational changes that were a result of the observations made by contractor personnel and by the Workshop Leaders. Overall, the content and format of the workshop were given good ratings, and there were few substantive changes made in the final revision.

Since the ultimate value of any training is its effect on the recipient, the ratings made by the workshop participants are of special interest. The rating form, which is included in Appendix C, was given to each participant who was asked to complete the statements at the conclusion of the workshop. The rating form along with instructions for its use are included in Appendix C, which the reader should review before turning to Table III which presents the summary of participant ratings. Table III clearly indicates that the participants rated the workshop very highly. It must be acknowledged that there are several factors which tend to lead to spuriously

Table II(a)

Pilot Test Staff and Attendees

Municipal Police Training Council of Connecticut
Meriden, Connecticut March 31, April 1 & 2, 1975

Workshop Leader:*	John F. Oates, Jr.
	Edward W. Bishop
Assisted by:	Frederic Morton

Participants:

Sergeant Frederick H. Bird	Connecticut State Police
Sergeant Thomas W. Hayes	Glastonbury Police Department
Sergeant Arnold H. Higgins	Glastonbury Police Department
Lieuterant James K. Fennell	Hartford Police Department
Detective William Tremont	Hartford Police Department
Sergeant Joseph Reilly	Stamford Police Department
Captain Rodney Varney	Stamford Police Department
Sergeant Frank T. Ragonese	Wethersfield Police Department
Lieutenant Carl E. Wood	Wethersfield Police Department

*Job was shared by two Dunlap and Associates, Inc., staff members.

Table II(b)

Pilot Test Staff and Attendees

New Hampshire Police Standards and Training Council
Laconia, New Hampshire — April 6-9, 1975

Workshop Leader:	Earl M. Sweeney
Assisted by:	Arthur D. Kehas
	John Muir
	Clarence Jeffery

Participants:

Chief Deputy Leonard Anderson	Grafton County Sheriff's Department
Deputy Chief Robert H. Belanger	Nashua Police Department
Captain Albert R. Bergeron	Claremont Police Department
Lieutenant Roger H. Caswell	Littleton Police Department
Deputy Sheriff Andrew Christie, Jr.	Rockingham Cty. Sheriff's Department
Captain Leo De Greenia	Concord Police Department
Deputy Chief Rodney A. Gervais	Rochester Police Department
Sergeant Robert Giusti	Salem Police Department
Lieutenant Colonel Kenneth M. Hayes	New Hampshire State Police
Sergeant Allen J. Hebert	Somersworth Police Department
Lieutenant Henri A. Moquin	Goffstown Police Department
Chief Alan McLean	Conway Police Department
Sergeant Hugh M. McLellan	Keene Police Department
Captain John A. Patrikus	Portsmouth Police Department
Detective Sergeant O'Neil Plummer	Berlin Police Department
Deputy Chief Benjamin St. Jacques	Franklin Police Department
Lieutenant Dana F. Weeks	Manchester Police Department
Chief Neal R. Wooley	Lebanon Police Department

Table II(c)

Pilot Test Staff and Attendees

Traffic Institute, Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois June 16-18, 1975

Workshop Leader:	Richard E. Stephens
Assisted by:	Stephen S. Caruso

Participants:

Patrolman Louis H. Barth	Glenview Police Department
Sergeant George F. Connelly	Chicago Police Department
Sergeant John Crimmins	Buffalo Grove Police Department
Commander Edward Dedmond	Northfield Police Department
Sergeant Phil S. Cangelosi	Wilmette Police Department
Lieutenant Henry Kmieciak	Evanston Police Department
Sergeant John Lawrence	Elgin Police Department
Sergeant John Macko	West Chicago Police Department
Sergeant James Dutton	Hoffman Estates Police Department
Commander Jay Mills	Northbrook Police Department
Lieutenant Robert O'Malley	Hinsdale Police Department
Sergeant LaVerne F. Pickett	Rockford Police Department
Sergeant Walter Schnurstein	Wheaton Police Department
Lieutenant Frank Stankowicz	Niles Police Department
Sergeant Robert T. Suvada	Chicago Police Department
Sergeant James Zack	Downers Grove Police Department
Lieutenant Anthony J. Zimmerman	Crystal Lake Police Department

Table III

Summary of Participants' Ratings

Each participant in each pilot test was asked to evaluate six aspects of the Workshop by selecting descriptive phrases that agreed with his opinions. The form used in this rating is contained in Appendix C. It consists of nine statements, each of which can be completed with one of three phrases. The first phrase in each set denotes a high rating; the second, average; and the third, low. For convenience in tabulation, the aspects are identified by name and number only. The complete descriptions can be read in Appendix C. The ratings are tabulated by number also: 1 for high, 2 for average, and 3 for low. The tabulation is of the number of ratings given in each pilot test and in total.

	Ratings											
	Conn.			N.H.			Traffic Inst.			Total		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
1. Factors	6	1		12	6		4	13		22	20	
2. Actions	2	4		10	8		5	12		17	24	
3. Presentation	7			17	1		9	7		33	8	
4. Discussion:												
Format	6	1		17	1		10	7		33	9	
Effectiveness	7			15	3		5	12		27	15	
5. Case Study:												
Format	3	4		14	4		8	7	2	25	15	2
Effectiveness	4	3		11	7		5	11		23	21	
6. Drinking Demonstration:												
Need	6	1		11	7		not done			17	8	
Audience	2	5		9	9					11	14	

high ratings of a training pilot test (see Appendix D). In spite of such factors, the very large preponderance of ratings in the highest category very strongly suggests good participant acceptance of the training content and format. Also, the comments volunteered by the participants were almost unanimously favorable and enthusiastic. In an attempt to analyze participant acceptance further, another form for data collection was used in the Traffic Institute test. In this form each participant was asked to indicate what he found most interesting about the training and what he found least interesting. Also, he was asked whether or not the training met his expectations and, finally, was asked for specific suggestions. One participant judged the entire course to be the most interesting part of the training, while eleven rated the format (i.e., case study and discussion) as the most interesting. Ten people rated, as least interesting, a part of that test that is not actually a part of the workshop. The Traffic Institute was unable, for administrative reasons, to conduct a drinking demonstration. Therefore, the evening session on the first day was devoted to a lecture and movie on the nature and effects of alcohol. That session was judged least interesting by ten of twelve people who made any comment in this category. One comment was that "nothing" was least interesting. The final comment recorded in that category was that the case study solution should have been undertaken by the class as a whole rather than four smaller groups. With regard to the expectations of the participants, nine felt that it met or exceeded their expectations. Three participants felt that it did not meet their expectations, and two of these added the comment that they had been under the impression they were to attend a DWI enforcement procedures training. The third major comment carried the qualifier that the participant had "the same thing many times before." As to specific suggestions for change, it was suggested that the evening session as given should be deleted and that the course should be scheduled for a longer presentation.

In all three tests, the desirability of a drinking demonstration was very strongly reinforced.

III. CONCLUSIONS

It is concluded that this project resulted in a training package which presents a necessary and interesting topic. Also, it is training for which there is no existing counterpart. The format and manner of presentation have been tested in three quite different settings and have unanimously been judged adequate or better. It is recommended that the training package be produced for dissemination through the Government Printing Office and that it be publicized through the manpower representatives in the Regional Offices.

If the means exist, it is also recommended that a continuing evaluation of this workshop be maintained. The reasons for this recommendation are that the format is not the usual classroom presentation, and it would be of interest to assess its effectiveness. Also, the content of this training is not the usual vocational training, and it would be of interest to determine the acceptance and impact of training for management attitude and action.

APPENDIX A.

Task Descriptions from the Project Plan

Task 1 - Planning

The objective of this task is to develop an effective, detailed plan for the conduct of this study. The following are the specific activities:

a. Submit and review preliminary Project Plan with CTM and other interested NHTSA personnel to resolve any differences in concept, approach or schedule. (Completed)

b. Discuss information available from NHTSA, particularly the insights and experience of the CTM and other interested staff. Identify other data sources. (Continuing task)

c. Discuss with CTM and NHTSA staff possible Pilot Test site and subjects; formulate a strategy for selecting a site and implementing the Pilot Test. (Continuing task)

d. Determine the need for more detailed planning, identify specific documentation requirements and submit Project Plan. (Completed herewith)

Task 2 - Development of Planning Guide

This task is devoted to the development of the basic document of the training package, the Planning Guide. For this package the overall format will be that of a "workshop" in order to involve the participants more directly, and give them the opportunity to contribute their thoughts and experiences to group discussion. However, the package may also include some traditional lecture/demonstration units. Therefore, the Planning Guide will resemble the guides produced for the traditional DOT training packages but will include planning and guidance information for the conduct of a workshop.

The Planning Guide will consist of three major parts: Planning and Administration, Instructor/Leader Qualifications, and Training Content. The first part, on planning and administration, will include the usual "logistical" considerations. For this package it will also emphasize the need for the sponsoring agency to select participants so that the Region (or State) is fully represented and so that the involvement of all management levels (sergeant through chief) is achieved. If this package is to accomplish its basic objective of creating a proper environment for DWI enforcement, it must reach the whole area and all levels of management. The Planning Guide will address this need.

The second part of the guide will describe the need for a qualified instructor/leader and enumerate the qualifications, as well as give guidance for the selection and indoctrination of a leader. This concern is also a special one for this package. The package is aimed at all levels of police management, and this requires the leader to be adaptable and be able to cope and communicate with participants of diverse levels and backgrounds. Also, much of the package will be presented as a workshop and effective leadership requires special skills.

The third section of the Planning Guide will contain the outline and general description of content. It will be produced from the training requirements (i.e., the results of the two DWI arrest factors studies) and will include development of instructional and behavioral objectives and instructional strategies.

Obviously, at this early stage in the study a final document cannot be produced. Throughout the development of instructor and participant materials there will arise matters of content and presentation that will affect the Planning Guide. Thus, the form of the Planning Guide for use in pilot testing will finally evolve only when the Instructor and Participant documents have been fully developed.

As indicated in the Schedule, an initial form of the Guide will be produced at the end of the third project month (September 1974) and will be revised for Pilot Test use in the sixth project month.

The specific activities to be accomplished in this task are described below:

a. Define training requirements. These are primarily the results of the two DWI studies. All of the results will be included as background. The results that directly affect management will be stressed. Also, requirements that may be referenced in or inferred from those studies will be included. In addition, the requirements will include the input of the CTM and other NHTSA staff.

b. Identify and define the required performance objectives (what the trainee will know and be able to do) as well as the instructional objectives. The former will be established with the help of the two consultants. The PI will derive the instructional objectives.

c. Define behavioral objectives that are responsive to the training requirements and are realistic in terms of the audience of this training.

d. Select instructional strategies and media that are appropriate to the projected audience, probable facilities and instructors and are sufficiently flexible for the widest possible implementation. The PI will assume major responsibility for these activities but will maintain close coordination with the CTM. Also, the PI will have the advantage of the Dunlap staff's considerable experience (including his own) in preparing and delivering training to law enforcement officers.

e. Prepare a preliminary guide for the workshop (course). To the extent appropriate, the currently used formats for NHTSA Course Guides will be applied. However, the most important part of this activity will be for the total Project staff to help determine a format that will most effectively present the requirements and objectives of this course.

f. Review the preliminary guide with the CTM and revise as required. Revision will continue as needs are indicated in subsequent tasks.

g. When the preliminary guide has been completed, an announcement of the package will be prepared by the Project staff for review by NHTSA and for NHTSA distribution. The announcement will be designed to publicize the package and to request support of the Pilot Test.

Task 3 - Instructor/Leader Outline

This document will be the functional equivalent of Instructor Lesson Plans. The traditional lesson outline format will be used where appropriate. For the workshop units an outline will be prepared that will include the background and knowledge (at least in outline) that the leader will need to be able to direct the unit. Also, guidance for the conduct of the unit including direction for the involvement of the participants will be included.

The following specific activities will be carried out in completing this task:

a. Partition the material into units appropriate to the behavioral objectives and the instructional strategy. Flexibility for adapting to various trainee levels, as well as to diverse training systems, will be a prime consideration in this activity.

b. Develop appropriate plans for each lesson (or case study problem or other presentation). To the extent that lecture/discussion is used, the format of previous NHTSA Instructor Lesson Plans will be used.

c. Determine need for training aids (visuals, films, models, etc.) and identify sources.

d. Produce draft outline with particular assistance by way of review and comment from consultants.

e. Review document with CTM and revise as required. Plans for each lesson (or unit) will be submitted to the CTM as soon as it is completed so the "document" will not necessarily be submitted as an entity.

f. Prepare Instructor/Leader Outline for the Pilot Test.

Task 4 - Participant Manual

The primary use of the Participant Manual will be as a reference document. During a 2-3 day workshop there is limited time available for study or work assignments; so there is little need for a study guide. We plan to compile a manual containing information on DWI enforcement relevant to police management personnel. The manual will include units on such topics as:

- Alcohol and highway safety.
- The alcohol-impaired driver.
- Role of enforcement in combatting problem.
- Factors influencing police officer discretion.
- Policy guidelines.
- Procedural guidelines.
- Etc.

Some of the materials already exist and can be used in their present form. Other materials will require some modification. Some may have to be developed.

The Participant/Student Manual and the Instructor Leader Outline will be developed more or less concurrently. This is necessary since there is a direct correspondence between the materials in both documents. The development of the Participant Manual will involve the following specific activities:

a. Develop the requirements for a Student Manual essentially in parallel with the development of the Instructor/Leader Outline. The objective of this activity is to identify the need for a student manual as a reference or source document and as a study guide.

b. Identify sources of material for the manual and initiate a collection process. Where necessary, copyright releases and permission will be obtained.

c. Develop new material for the manual as needed.

d. Submit the Participant Manual (or completed sections) for CTM review.

e. Revise the manual as the need is indicated.

f. Produce a Participant Manual for use in Pilot Testing.

Task 5 - Pilot Test

Upon completion of the training package (and review by NHTSA), a pilot test of the workshop will be conducted. The Pilot Test will be held at a location that is reasonably convenient and accessible to the CTM and the project staff. A sponsoring agency will be located through the announcement that is issued at the close of Task 2 and subsequent follow-up. The Project Director will be responsible for evaluating candidate locations with close, direct support from NHTSA.

The Pilot Test is essentially a presentation of the package under wholly realistic conditions. That is, the facilities, the participants and the instructor will be representative of conditions that will be encountered when the final version of the package is put to actual use. Obviously, complete simulation of actual conditions is not possible, if only because not all actual applications can be forecast. The principle, however, will be followed. The project staff with the aid of NHTSA will carefully select a test site to maximize the validity of the evaluation.

Instructor/leaders must be carefully selected for both subject matter knowledge as well as group leadership skills. If the sponsoring staff does not include such personnel, the project staff may be used. This option will be examined as the candidate sites respond to the announcement.

The following specific activities will be performed:

a. Identify Pilot Test site and subjects, based on the initial selection activities that were begun in the planning task (Task 1, above). This activity will be closely coordinated with the CTM to insure that the site offers a reasonable opportunity to validate the training package and is satisfactory to NHTSA. The contacts that have been made by Dunlap and by the Young consultant will be fully exploited.

b. Select instructors for the Pilot Test. It is reasonable to consider the use of local instructors, since they may be thought of as "representative." If this does not seem to be a tenable assumption, the possibility of using this project's staff or of recruiting instructors from local schools having police courses will be examined. This will be coordinated with the CTM. The primary objective is to achieve a fair and valid test of the package. However, the convenience of the cooperating department(s) and their wishes will be respected.

c. Develop a plan for the conduct of Pilot Test and evaluation. Criteria for evaluation by instructors, trainees and the project staff (who, if not instructing, will observe the test) will be developed, as well as a means for collecting the data (rating sheets, etc.).

d. Submit the Pilot Test plan and criteria for evaluation to CTM for review and concurrence.

e. Develop a detailed schedule and "logistics" plan with the cooperating department(s).

f. Conduct Pilot Test and evaluation.

Task 6 - Revised Training Package (Final Draft)

Based on the information gained from the pilot test, the entire package will be revised and prepared in final form. One camera-ready reproducible and five copies will be transmitted to NHTSA along with the original art work for any visuals. If there are any major changes resulting from the pilot test, they will be discussed with the CTM prior to preparation of final copy.

The following are the specific activities that will be carried out in this task:

a. Collect and interpret results of Pilot Test and evaluation.

b. Develop recommendations for revision of package.

c. Submit recommended changes to CTM for review and concurrence.

d. Make revisions to the training material as agreed upon with the CTM.

e. Prepare and submit final copy (as specified) for the entire package.

Task 7 - Final Report

In addition to the three major end-products, a final technical report will be prepared and submitted. This report will describe the purpose, objectives and scope of the study; the approach employed in developing, listing and evaluating the training package; and recommendations for future improvement.

The following activities will be performed:

a. Develop an outline for the Final Report with the CTM to reflect the objectives, method, and results (in general) of the project.

b. Identify other purposes to be fulfilled by the Final Report and reflect these in the outline.

c. Prepare and submit draft for review and concurrence.

d. Prepare and submit Final Technical Report.

APPENDIX B.

Workshop Schedule

The schedule contained in the following pages is the schedule of the final version of the workshop. In earlier versions, prior to pilot testing, only 2-1/2 days were used and the scheduled time per unit was slightly different. The principle of the workshop organization remains the same, however, which is to present the basic material, allow for discussion and allow for practice. In this connection, see especially Units 11-18.

WORKSHOP ON FACTORS INFLUENCING DWI ARRESTS

Day One

0900-0930 Unit 1. Workshop Introduction

The purpose of this unit is to introduce the attendees to the workshop leader and each other, and to describe the techniques that will be used during the workshop. Any administrative matters should be accomplished in this time period.

0930-1030 Unit 2. Exercise to Identify Factors in Simulated Alcohol-related Violations

Using scenarios of hypothetical, but realistic, alcohol-related traffic offenses, the participants are asked to state whether or not an arrest would be made in each scenario and to identify the factors that led them to their conclusion. This unit serves to introduce the research results by leading the participants to think and talk about factors that could influence a patrolman's decision.

1030-1045 Unit 3. Research Studies of Factors--Background

This unit describes how patrolmen were surveyed to identify factors that influence their arrest decisions. This unit includes a brief summary of the approach used in each of the two basic studies, and a brief description of the survey activities.

1045-1200 Unit 4. Factors Associated with Officers' Attributes and Attitude

This unit summarizes factors, such as the officers' age, length of service, and drinking habits, as they relate to the arrest decision in an alcohol-related traffic offense.

1200-1300 Lunch

1300-1400 Unit 5. Factors Associated with the Local Environment and the Specific Incident

This unit presents those factors that are found in the local environment of the patrolman, such as department policy, court procedure and arrest processing time, as well as those factors that are found in the incident, itself, such as the age or sex of the driver, the weather conditions, and the time of day.

1400-1500 Unit 6. Recommendations for Command or Supervisory Actions

This unit summarizes the recommendations that were developed in the research studies for specific actions to be taken by command and supervisory personnel. The actions concern the major management areas of policy, operations, training and communication. This unit provides an overview of the set of recommendations, each of which is treated in more detail in subsequent units.

1500-1600 Unit 7. Alcohol-related Offenses and Enforcement

This unit includes a brief presentation and a direct discussion about the significance of alcohol-related offenses, the total process of enforcement (with particular emphasis on the role of police in enforcement) and information about legal limits of intoxication. Local applications or local considerations can be incorporated here and emphasized.

1600-2200 Unit 8. Controlled Drinking Demonstration

In this unit, volunteers from among the participants drink controlled amounts of alcohol and are then given BAC analyses and are asked to perform some psychomotor tests. Drinking and testing continue under controlled conditions until at least some of the volunteers have reached or exceeded a legal limit. During the early part of this evening session, there will be a presentation and discussion of the nature and effects of alcohol. Alternative activities

are described for the possibility that a demonstration could not be performed. (If necessary, half of the group can take part in this session, and half in a second session the next evening.)

1630-1800 Unit 9. Nature and Effect of Alcohol Intoxication

This unit includes information about the chemistry of alcohol, the physiology of intoxication, the relationship between BAC and performance, as well as a description of the symptoms of inebriation. This unit is a brief presentation of all these topics but emphasizes those which the studies of factors influencing alcohol-related arrests have shown to be important. (This unit is presented during the Drinking Demonstration - Unit 8.)

WORKSHOP ON FACTORS INFLUENCING

DWI ARRESTS

(continued)

Day Two

0900-1000 Unit 10. Review of Controlled Drinking Demonstration

This unit is a relatively unstructured discussion of the previous evening's demonstration. If videotapes have been made, they will be shown at this time, and any test scores including handwriting samples collected in the demonstration will be examined. The objective of the review is to reinforce the demonstration of performance changes and associated BAC level.

If a controlled drinking demonstration has not been scheduled, this unit can be devoted to a film or to a discussion of the previous day's activities.

1000-1100 Unit 11. Policy-related Factors and Recommendations

This unit begins with a summary of the factors and related recommendations from the research studies in the area of departmental policy. It is followed by a discussion in which each of the participants relates the traffic material to his own experience and his department policies and practices.

1100-1200 Unit 12. Case Study--Introduction and Policy-related Activity

This unit is the first of four devoted to group problem-solving, based on a fictional but realistic case study. In each of the four units, information about the fictional study is presented, beginning with a sequence of events that led to a demand for a more effective alcohol-related program. In each unit the participants are asked to identify factors in the

narrative and to develop, in as much detail as possible within the time allowed, appropriate command and supervisory actions based on the results of the study in the topic area, as well as on their own experience. In this unit the participants are expected to develop some ideas about appropriate departmental policy.

1200-1300	Lunch	
1300-1400	Unit 12.	(continued)
1400-1500	Unit 13.	Operations-related Factors and Recommendations This unit summarizes the operations-related factors and recommendations and provides for discussion. It is in the same format as Unit 11.
1500-1630	Unit 14.	Case Study (continued)--Operations-related Activity This unit is the second of the case-study units. The participants will develop their ideas about policy implementation as expressed in an operations plan.
1630-2200	Unit 15.	Second Controlled Drinking Demonstration If needed, the demonstration can be repeated. Unit 8 is followed except that the nature and effects of intoxication need not be repeated. A film can be shown or the time made available for open discussion.

WORKSHOP ON FACTORS INFLUENCING

DWI ARRESTS

(continued)

Day Three

0900-1000	Unit 16.	Review of Second Controlled Drinking Demonstration Unit 10 is repeated here if a second drinking session was scheduled for the previous night. If this is not needed, all of the following units are presented one hour earlier than indicated.
1000-1100	Unit 17.	Training-related Factors and Recommendations This unit summarizes the training-related factors and recommendations and provides for discussion. It is the same format as Unit 11.
1100-1200	Unit 18.	Case Study (continued)--Training-related Activity This unit is the third of the case-study units. The participants will identify training needs from the case-study narrative.
1200-1300	Lunch	
1300-1400	Unit 19.	Communication-related Factors and Recommendations This unit summarizes the communication-related factors and recommendations and provides for discussion. It is in the same format as Unit 11.
1400-1500	Unit 20.	Case Study (continued)--Communication-related Activity This unit is the fourth and final case-study unit. The participants will identify communication needs from the case-study narrative.

1500-1600 **Workshop Summary**

In this unit the salient points of the 3-day session are summarized by the workshop leader. The format and depth of this summary are left to the discretion of each leader. Following the summary, if it is desired, a brief time can be devoted to obtaining participant reaction or critique of the workshop.

APPENDIX C.

Evaluation Plan

MEMORANDUM

5 March 1975

TO: Mr. Cecil Arnold, NHTSA-CTM

FROM: Mr. Edward W. Bishop, Dunlap and Associates, Inc.

SUBJECT: Evaluation Plan for Police Management Training Package on Factors Influencing DWI Arrests (Contract DOT-HS-4-00987)

1. There are basically two objectives in evaluating a training package by means of a pilot test:

   a. to determine if the scope and coverage of the content is adequate

   b. to determine if the package has been designed for effective delivery.

   Further, in this project, the evaluation must be made in such a way that not only are any deficiencies identified, but also in a way that the means for correcting them are made evident. This pilot test must lead to effective revision of the training package.

2. We have been concerned about the validity of the pilot test since the inception of this project. Because of the workshop approach, it was suggested early in the project that perhaps special leaders (instructors) should be found who were experienced in conducting such sessions. It was decided, however, that such special selection was not appropriate since the workshop would ultimately be presented by available instructors. Thus, the most valid pilot test is one that uses available instructors--and available facilities as well. We have fully adopted this "realistic" approach. The training package is being delivered to the test sites with virtually no comment or guidance. The intent of this is to simulate the purchase of the training package from the GPO. When the package is published, that will be the way the agency procures it. We will do some preliminary planning with each test site, of course, but we will try to avoid influencing the actual conduct or the leader's preparation. Our goal is to see what the local training administrator and instructor can do with just the training package.

   In the observation of the pilot tests, we will be as unobtrusive as possible to try to preserve the realism of the session. I plan only to make a few introductory remarks, mainly about the evaluation, and then become a silent observer. At the conclusion, I will have something more to do about collecting evaluation forms and recording comments, but no more than that.

3. To accomplish the above objectives, I have developed this pilot test plan which has the following features:

   a. Pilot tests will be run at up to three locations to provide as broad a sampling of reaction as possible within our resources. (As of the date of this memorandum Maryland remains uncertain about putting on the test.)

   b. Each document of the package will be evaluated by the user group to which it is addressed.

   c. Observers (the author and the Arthur Young and Company consultant) will attend the pilot tests to observe and evaluate the conduct of the workshop and to interview the leader and the participants.

   d. All evaluations will be in two parts--content and presentation.

   e. Ratings or other quantitative techniques will be used to the extent that they can be practically applied. The purpose of this is to provide at least an approximate measure or index of quality.

   f. Non-quantitative evaluation will also be used particularly to identify content problems (i.e., what should be included or what should be dropped). Also the reasons underlying the ratings will be sought in this way. The non-quantitative evaluation will include interviews and annotations to the rating forms.

   g. The administrators and instructors at each site have already been requested to review the Planning Guide and the Workshop Leader Outline critically as they prepare for the pilot test.

4. I plan to visit--or have Ted Holmes visit--each test site prior to the actual pilot. (This will probably be the day, or at least the afternoon, prior to the workshop.) At this time, much of the evaluation of the guide and the outline will be accomplished. We will use a checklist--see attached--and interview the instructor and the administrator.

5. The schedule for data collection during the workshop will be as follows:

Day One - prior to official start

Observer introduce self, describe concept of evaluation and pilot test; solicit participant help and distribute Participant Rating Form. See attached outline and Form.

Days One, Two and Three - daily workshop sessions

Observer monitor presentation, discussion and general participation; use Observer Workshop Rating form (see attached). During break periods obtain comments and expressions of attitude from leader and participants.

Day One - drinking demonstration or evening discussion period

Observer monitor as above. Use rating form as applicable. For demonstration use special form attached.

Day Three - at conclusion of workshop

Observer thank group for evaluation, collect rating forms from participants. Request leader to complete summary rating form, see attached.

6. The evaluation will, of course, begin with a compilation of the data from the sources mentioned above. Even though the quantitative, statistical aspect of this evaluation is much less significant than the qualitative inputs and comments, it is convenient to talk about the process in quantitative terms. We will first combine ratings to identify areas that require changes in content or format. In this process we will look for consistency among the test sites and will attempt to account for any apparently anomalous ratings. The objective here will be to construct, in effect, a "profile" for each document that reflects the quality (or utility) of each section. These "profiles" will be the basis for revision of the training package. They will identify areas and possibly the relative need for revision among the areas.

7. In the evaluation we will emphasize these factors:

   a. Consistency - we will identify users' (leaders and participants) needs and criticisms that are common to all the test sites. We will avoid acting on comments that reflect unique needs.

   b. Relevance - the workshop is about Factors Influencing the Patrolman's DWI Arrest Decision. Content changes or additions should not go too far afield from this.

   c. Value - we will concentrate on those areas that are identified as important or of special value.

   d. Utility - especially with regard to format we will try to find and apply the advice and comments of the users that relate to the adaptability of the workshop to a range of local environments. Our objective is a "universal" training package.

   e. Validity - in this evaluation we will try to screen out comments and criticisms that are stimulated by instructor performance or are an artifact of the location or facilities. We want to avoid undertaking any revision of the package because the leader used it poorly. This will be difficult, but it is an objective of the evaluation.

8. A report of the evaluation, including forms and results, will be included in the Final Technical Report of this contract.

Beginning on the following page are the evaluation instruments referenced in this memorandum.

OBSERVER'S INTRODUCTION: EVALUATION

Time (Elapsed) Actual	Activity	Instructor Notes and Visual Aids
(0:00) 0:02	INTRODUCTION 1. Introduce self: . company affiliation . DOT contractor 2. Describe role in preparing training package. 3. Thanks to sponsoring agency and participants. OTHER OBSERVERS 1. Introduce any other observers--DOT, other visitors. 2. We are here to help in the evaluation of the training package, not to take part in the session. 3. Want to ask your help in evaluation.	
(0:02) 0:02	OBJECTIVES 1. This is pilot test. One purpose is to convey information to participants; a second is to evaluate the training package. (Note the contents of package.) 2. Participant asked to perform dual role . participant (more important) . evaluator (necessary) 3. Ultimate objective is to produce revised--better--package.	

OBSERVER'S INTRODUCTION: EVALUATION

Time (Elapsed) Actual	Activity	Instructor Notes and Visual Aids
(0:04) 0:06	METHOD 1. Data will be collected from leader and participants and by observers about quality and usefulness of content and format. 2. You are asked to rate the workshop (pass out forms). . show form . describe use 3. Emphasize topic of the Workshop--evaluation must be relevant. 4. Evaluate in terms of own (participant's) needs and own practices. 5. Please make ratings at end of session. Keep notes and comments in space provided. (0:10)	

Police Management Training:
Factors Influencing DWI Arrests

Rating Form
(participant)

This workshop is intended to provide information about the factors influencing the DWI arrest decision, and the recommended command or supervisory actions to increase DWI enforcement. It also provides a means for applying this information in a case study.

We would like you to help us determine how well the workshop meets its objectives. Inside are eight rating scales, one for each important area of the workshop. You are asked to evaluate the content of the workshop as well as the way in which it was presented.

At the close of the workshop you will be asked to circle each statement that best describes your reactions. Please do not mark the form until then. In the meantime, record your observations or notes in the space provided. You can refer to them when you make your ratings.

We would appreciate any comments or evaluations of how this workshop was conducted and of the material that was given to you. Please record your comments on this sheet and additional pages, if needed.

1. Factors: Information on attitudinal and other factors that influence the DWI arrest decision was the basic content of this workshop. Do you feel that in your job this information will be:

Important and Necessary Useful Not Needed

2. Actions: Also, information about actions that police command and supervisory personnel can take to increase DWI enforcement was presented. Do you feel that in your job this information will be:

Important and Necessary Useful Not Needed

3. Presentation: Most of the above information was presented by the leader in a lecture type presentation. What is your opinion of the presentations?

Well Done Adequate Poorly Done

4. Discussion: To help you relate this information to your own job, much of the workshop was devoted to discussion periods. How do you feel about this format. (The Case Study will be rated separately, this refers only to the discussion.)

Well Done Adequate Poorly Done

Did you learn much in these sessions?

Gained Much Some No Help

5. Case Study: At four times in the workshop you were asked to develop a solution to a case study. How do you feel about this format?

Well Done Adequate Poorly Done

Did you learn much in doing the case study?

Gained Much Some No Help

6. Drinking Demonstration: The controlled demonstration is intended to illustrate the relationship among alcohol ingested, BAC and performance. Do you feel that this session was

Important and Necessary Useful Unnecessary

How would you recommend this demonstration to command and supervisory personnel?

Needed by all personnel Needed by most Needed by few, if any

COMMENTS

(if you wish)

Name: _____

Address: _____

_____

44 C

NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

Please add any comments on the back of this form. -45-

Police Management Training: Factors Influencing DWI Arrests

Workshop Leader Summary Rating

1. What is your overall impression of the Workshop based on your own experience with this kind of training:

Better than most	Better than many	Average	Poorer than many	Poorer than most

2. How many hours would you estimate that you spent in preparing to lead this Workshop?

3. Do you feel that this amount of preparation for a 2-1/2 day session is?

More than should be expected	Average	Less than is usually spent

4. You received copies of the technical reports that are the basis of this Workshop. Did the Workshop allow adequate presentation of these two studies? Yes ☐ No ☐

5. If not, please specify what topics or areas were omitted or not treated adequately.

6. Did the Workshop allow you to include appropriate local material?

Yes ☐ No ☐

7. If not, please identify the specific problems you had.

Police Management Training: Factors Influencing DWI Arrests

Workshop Leader Summary Rating

8. The Workshop Leader Outline is designed to help you prepare your own outline and aids for each unit. How would you rate this document?

Very Useful	Adequate	Difficult to me

9. Any specific suggestions for changes or additions to the Outline will be useful in preparing the final version of this document.

10. Would you comment on the case study approach--is it a useful approach, did you feel that you were able to make effective use of it, etc.

Police Management Training: Factors Influencing DWI Arrests

Observer Rating Form: Drinking Demonstration

1. What is your overall impression of the facilities and equipment?

   Outstanding Adequate Poor

2. Does the leader have control over the demonstration?

   Participants are orderly

   Maintains schedule

   Preparations are effective

3. In what areas does the leader appear to need more help?

   Content of presentations

   Scheduling of demonstration

   Objectives

4. What deficiencies could have been helped by better documentation?

5. What changes are suggested in:

   Content

   Format

   Objectives

6. Was the breath analysis equipment properly prepared and operated? What specific problems (if any) were encountered?

7. What performance tests were used?

8. What is your evaluation of these tests?

Police Management Training: Factors Influencing DWI Arrests

Observer Rating Form: Workshop

1. You should evaluate the workshop first on its overall effect: (circle one)

   Outstanding Adequate Poor

2. Complete the attached "Participant Rating Form" as though you were a participant.

3. Please record your observations of the participants:

   Interest:

   Participation:

4. Please record your observations of the leader:

   Preparation:

   Techniques:

   Relates to Participants:

   Involves Participants:

5. In what areas--content or format--does he need more help or support?

6. What deficiencies could have been avoided by different documentation?

7. What specific changes to the Workshop Leader Outline are indicated?

Police Management Training: Factors Influencing DWI Arrests

Observer Checklist - Pre Workshop

1. Number of registrants _____

2. Instructors: _____ Responsibility _____
   (name)
   _____ _____
   _____ _____

3. General evaluation of facilities and equipment:

4. Pre registration material (name tags, notebooks, etc.): Were Participant Manuals distributed at enrollment?

5. Workshop leader attitude:

6. Workshop leader knowledge (what questions does he ask)?

7. Are either separate or team work stations available for the case study?

8. What is the mix of command and supervisory levels among the participants?

9. How does leader plan to deal with this mix?

10. Have local materials been obtained? Evaluate leader's plans for using them.

11. What is leader's (administrator's) opinion of the Planning Guide? Note specific comments.

Police Management Training: Factors Influencing DWI Arrests

Observer Rating Form: Workshop

1. You should evaluate the workshop first on its overall effect: (circle one)

   Outstanding Adequate Poor

2. Complete the attached "Participant Rating Form" as though you were a participant.

3. Please record your observations of the participants:

   Interest:

   Participation:

4. Please record your observations of the leader:

   Preparation:

   Techniques:

   Relates to Participants:

   Involves Participants:

5. In what areas--content or format--does he need more help or support?

6. What deficiencies could have been avoided by different documentation?

7. What specific changes to the Workshop Leader Outline are indicated?

Police Management Training: Factors Influencing DWI Arrests

Observer Checklist - Pre Workshop

1. Number of registrants _____

2. Instructors: _____ Responsibility _____
   (name)
   _____ _____
   _____ _____

3. General evaluation of facilities and equipment:

4. Pre registration material (name tags, notebooks, etc.): Were Participant Manuals distributed at enrollment?

5. Workshop leader attitude:

6. Workshop leader knowledge (what questions does he ask)?

7. Are either separate or team work stations available for the case study?

8. What is the mix of command and supervisory levels among the participants?

9. How does leader plan to deal with this mix?

10. Have local materials been obtained? Evaluate leader's plans for using them.

11. What is leader's (administrator's) opinion of the Planning Guide? Note specific comments.

APPENDIX D.

Memorandum Reports
of Pilot Tests
by
Connecticut Municipal Police Training Council
New Hampshire Police Standards and Training Council
Traffic Institute, Northwestern University

MEMORANDUM

14 April 1975

TO: Mr. Cecil Arnold, CTM - NHTSA

FROM: Mr. Edward W. Bishop - Dunlap and Associates, Inc.

SUBJECT: Preliminary Report of Pilot Test: Police Management Training - Factors Influencing DWI Arrests (Contract No. DOT-HS-4-00987)

1. Two pilot tests of the subject training package have been completed. The first was conducted under the auspices of the Connecticut Municipal Police Training Council on March 31, April 1 and 2. The second was sponsored by the New Hampshire Police Standards and Training Council on April 6 - 9. The Connecticut test was conducted in the Connecticut Police Academy, Meriden, Connecticut and the New Hampshire test was conducted in a motel meeting rom in Laconia, New Hampshire. In the Connecticut test the bulk of the presentation was the responsibility of contractor personnel (Messrs. J. Oates, A. Hale and E. Bishop). It was originally intended that the Connecticut Council would provide an instructor; however, the timing and circumstances of the test precluded the instructor from doing more than providing support to the contractor instructors. The New Hampshire test was conducted entirely by local personnel with only minimum support and advice from the contractor prior to and during the test.

2. Because of the conditions described above, the New Hampshire test will be considered the "official" pilot test since it was conducted with no outside support in a way that simulates very faithfully what might happen if the training materials had been purchased from the Government Printing Office.

The Connecticut test did provide the opportunity for contractor personnel to experience at first hand the demands that are made of the workshop leader in this training package. The insights thus gained, as well as the reactions of the participants, are valuable inputs for revision of the training package even though the conduct of the test was not completely "realistic."

64

(continued)

In addition to the limitations noted just above, there is an inherent limitation in pilot testing that should be noted before considering the results of the tests. This limitation is that given the circumstances under which pilot tests for NHTSA training packages are conducted there is a built-in bias toward satisfactory or better results. We know that in situations like these tests the participant is inclined to rate favorably for several reasons:

- Since, for the most part, the topic is a new one to the participant, he might incline to attribute any lack of understanding to his own lack of knowledge rather than to the quality of the training package.

- Common courtesty demands a high tolerance on the part of participants.

- Simply having been invited to participate in a training developmental activity probably generates a positive attitude on the part of the instructor and participants.

A warning that must be raised from these considerations is that the evaluation made by the participants cannot be accepted as an absolute value, but must be tempered to account for the favorable bias. The ultimate value of this training, i.e., changed management behavior, cannot for all practical purposes be determined.

3. Results

Even with due acknowledgement to the limitations noted in paragraph 2 above, the results of both tests indicate that the training package is an effective one and one that will recieve an interested, perhaps enthusiastic, reception. All of the participants at both sites endorsed the need for this training course and indicated that the essential content, i.e., recommended command and supervisory actions, was well covered. The instructors at both sites, as well as the observers and a substantial number of participants, suggested that more time was needed for proper presentation of this course.

4. Observations

The following is a collection of observations that were made at either or both of the test sites by one or more of the observers and in some cases by the instructors and participants. No attempt is made here to rank these observations, but our conclusion is that each of the observations requires a response in the future development of this training package.

05

(continued)

- It is important to achieve greater involvement of the participants. This package is intended to be a vehicle for the participants in applying newly gained information in a case study practice session. The emphasis throughout this course must be on the application of the material to each participant's own department and community. There seemed to be a tendency for all of the instructors to lecture more than discuss and a willingness on the part of the participants to listen. This is not unexpected since it is the traditional classroom mode of instruction, but there must be more guidance in this package toward the desired goal of participation. The revised course will include more information about theinstructional strategy. Also, especially in view of the reluctance of the Connecticut instructor to attempt the entire course, there will be a suggestion for the possible use of other than police training officers. Such civilian instructors it will be suggested will augment rather than replace the police trainer.

- This package has been organized around four concepts, policy, operation, training and communication. In both test sites, an unnecessarily long time was spent in defining these concepts when the emphasis should have been on application in the case study. To help overcome this the revised package will include more explicit definitions of each concept thatwill be presented at appropriate times in the case study and will be reproduced in the participant manual for reference.

- With regard to the apparently limited time, there are three areas where changes can be made so that the content is not adversely affected and more time is available to the case study. First, the review of the controlled drinking demonstration can be better structured to make more affective use of the time. In Connecticut, the review included viewing a tape that recorded the entire demonstration. At about half way throug the tape its viewing was terminated, but the total time devoted to the unit far exceeded the scheduled one hour. Second, the unit which is devoted to a summary of recommendations from the two research studies will be eliminated. This can be done with no penalty because in each of the four case study units there is an opportunity to present the recommendations relevant to that unit. In the present design, this represents a redundancy that will be eliminated in the revised package. Finally with regard to timing, it appeared that the discussion of the case study solutions could have been more rigidly controlled for better use of time. There will be some guidance in the revised package to help achieve this discipline which along with the definition of concepts mentioned earlier, should improve the efficiency of the case study.

(continued)

- It was observed and suggested that perhaps the case study could be presented in a more flexible format so that it can be adapted more readily to each participant's own experience.

- It was suggested that the demonstration as scheduled in the training package requires too large a dosage of drinking in a short time and that a longer time might be allowed for this unit.

5. Actions

The first action obviously is to revise the training documents to reflect the changes noted in paragraph 4 above. Essentially these changes will be to make better use of the time, to stimulate greater involvement of the participants and establish a better understaind of the management concepts around which the recommended actions are organized. There are in addition the more specific revisions, someof which have been noted in the preceding paragraph, and many of which are in the observer's notes. One such revision deserves special mention here. That revision is one that will alter the context of the ASAP research study to help insure that it is given equal attention with the non-ASAP report. The format of the training document used in the pilot tests as well as the format of the original studies themselves tend to unduly emphasize the non-ASAP report and as a consequence some of the significant ASAP results were elided.

The revision of training strategy merits some consideration as a separate item. As indicated in paragraph 4, we will emphasize the instructor qualities required by this course and will include more specific guidance to facilitate delivery of the course by representative police training officers. In addition, the revision will suggest that civilian instructors, particularly ones who would be aware of the attitudinal or motivational basis of many of the factors, should be considered for delivery of parts of this package. Finally, as a consequence of the special demands on the instructor as well as the clear indication that the content of this couse can profitably occupy more than the scheduled 2-1/2 days, the potential integration of this workshop into a college or other more extensive curriculum will be considered at greater length and certainly will be emphasized.

(continued)

6. Further Testing

In view of the fact that the Connecticut test was not truly representative and the fact that the participants in the New Hampshire test represented only relatively small departments, a question was raised in the minds of the observers as to whether or not this package should be tested in a larger, more formal police training environment. The environment of a large municipal or metropolitan police department was suggested. Such further testing would be highly desirable. It would be of special interest to observe the acceptance of the content by participants from a large urban department and there would certainly be great benefit from the experience of a perhaps better trained and more experience training officer in dealing with this workshop. Both results: the reception given DWI training and the refinement of instructional strategy certainly warrant serious consideration of one more pilot test. The resources for testing available to the present contract have been exhausted. The original agreement was to provide one test and two have been completed; it would only detract from the quality of the final product to divert any remaining resources to further testing. In this context, the resources include both time and money. If a further test is to be undertaken, a minimum of 30 additional days would be needed and it would be desirable to accommodate contingencies by extending for 60 days. An estimate of the additional costs for such a test will be provided.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mr. Cecil Arnold
Contract Technical Monitor

24 June 1975

FROM: Edward W. Bishop
Project Director

SUBJECT: Pilot Test of DWI Workshop at Traffic Institute
Northwestern University, June 16-18

1. The objective of this pilot test was to try out the training package using a professional police training officer and an audience composed of representatives of relatively large urban police departments. In the first pilot test, contractor personnel served as instructors, which of course is not a realistic test situation; while in the second pilot test, the audience was made up of representatives of quite small departments throughout the state of New Hampshire. The Training Institute was selected as a site for this pilot test at the suggestion of Mr. R. Frederick, and Institute personnel were willing and extremely cooperative in the entire schedule of preparation and presentation of this training package. This test was conducted with an apparently high degree of realism. The Traffic Institute was paid to carry out all aspects of this training, including instructor preparation, student recruitment and presentation. There were no restrictions placed on the institute except that we requested recruitment of students from larger urban departments. As in the case of the New Hampshire test, the Institue was allowed to prepare and adapt the material as seemed appropriate to their particular situation. One major departure from the recommended form for this training was that the Institute decided not to offer a controlled drinking demonstration. Their reason was that, with commuting students, the problems of providing adequate safeguards, especially in transportation, were greater than was warranted by the potential benefits of the demonstration. The rest of the Workshop was delivered as might be expected, with some variations in order of presentation and emphasis as dictated by the experience of the instructor and his perception of the needs of the audience. We have not as yet received a statistical summary of the department size and other characteristics from the Traffic Institute. However, using a statistical summary published in 1973, the 16 departments represented in the audience ranged from the largest, Chicago, with a total of almost 15,000 employees to the smallest, Northfield, with a total of 21 employees. If the concept has any utility, the "representative department" in this pilot test had about 50 employees in the 1973 report. The ranks of the students ranged from a patrolman who has been

(continued)

selected for sergeant, to lieutenant and commander. Because of the difference in department size and organization, it is difficult to generalize about these ranks. It appeared, however, that the students represented a reasonably complete cross-section of supervisory personnel. It appeared that there were no "command personnel" as that phrase might be construed in very large departments.

2. Overall, the pilot test was successful. The participants were asked to rate several aspects of the Workshop, and of the 17 who attended there were only 2 ratings made on the "below average" side of the scale. These 2 ratings indicated that the case study was poorly done. Since the ratingsand evaluation are anonymous, we cannot be sure who made these ratings, nor do we know what other comments they made. It appears that these 2 people were under the impression that they were to receive training in DWI enforcement by means of a STEP approach. If we have correctly put the comments and ratings together, the negative reaction to the case study approach is quite understanable. All of the other participant ratings were made at the midpoint of a 3-point scale or at the high end of the scale. The format of the Workshop includes presentation by the Workshop Leader, directed discussion, and a case study. Each of these formats was rated well done by over half of the participants. In addition, 14 out of 17 responses about "the most interesting part of this training" related to the form of presentation, and of these 14 about half commended the discussion and free exchange of ideas and half commended the case study approach. The ratings of the content of the Workshop were generally favorable but not nearly as high as were given in New Hampshire or in Connecticut. We can conjecture that the generally higher rating of content by the New Hampshire group may have been stimulated by their participation in a current, very active ASAP. Further, it is not unlikely that the larger departments represented at the most recent test would have more missions or objectives that compete with DWI enforcement and, thus, generate a perception of lower priority for that enforcement. Finally, with regard to participants' rating of content and format, it is interesting to note that the controlled drinking demonstration was specifically identified by approximately half of the group as an important and valuable teaching device. The CRASH film of "Five Drinking Drivers" was generally acknowledged to be interesting and a reasonable substitute for a demonstration, but the overall feeling was strongly in favor of actual demonstration and participation by each of the group.

3. The ratings given by the Workshop Leader suggest that the training material is very useful and is given average and better than average ratings with regard to content and required preparation. The Leader further indicated that the case study seemed to him to be a useful concept but one with which he was not completely comfortable since this was his first exposure to it. He also indicated that he would like to have

(continued)

had more freedom for adapting the case study in terms of the few parameters that are given in the scenario and that he would have liked to have a "solution" to use as a yardstick in evaluating participants' solutions. In conversations with the Workshop Leader and the assistant instructor (who conducted the evening units concerning the pharmacology and chemistry of alcohol, and alcohol and highway safety) the point was made and emphasized that the training package is much better than average with regard to amount of detail and guidance for presentation. In general, the reaction of Traffic Institute staff members was favorable but they felt that there is a great deal of material to be covered in 2-1/2 days which, if the time cannot be extended, requires the Leader to be extremely careful in allocating the available time and in controlling the discussion.

4. In my observation, I did not detect the need for any substantive change in content or format. It appeared that the instructor was well prepared and, subject to some reservations I'll not below, did a commendable job of presenting the material. Throughout the session I had the feeling that there was too little time for each of the topics and that there was a marked tendency to spend too much time in discussion of the factors, themselves, in contrast to the management actions that evolve from those factors. This seems to be a natural enough inclination. The factors are based on "street" experience that each of the participants has had, and it is intriguing to compare one's own experience to the results of a study which purport to be general reactions of police officers. Some of this can be extremely useful in that it helps to validate in each participant's own mind the existence of the factor. However, it is very easy for this to be carried so far as to become an exchange of "war stories." I think that the session came to close to that latter state a couple of times, but the instructor did overall keep the group under reasonably good control. The reservation I noted about the Workshop Leader has to do with his manner or style of presentation. It was obvious that the Leader is a well trained and disciplined instructor in the traditional classroom mode. He recorded a degree of discomfort with the Workshop mode of presentation in his formal rating and, in conversations during the course of the Workshop, he indicated that he suffered the temptation to present an authoritarian position during some of the discussion sessions rather than allowing the discussions to develop more or less freely. I feel that, since I have been involved so closely with the development of this package, I am particularly sensitive to the attitude of the Leader and the requirements that this training package puts on him. I think, in other words, that the participants were probably not aware of any uneasiness on the part of the Workshop Leader. There were, in fact, about three or four comments specifically about the high quality of instructorship. One participant suggested that Mr. Stephens was, by virtue of his police experience, particularly well qualified to present this material.

(continued)

5. The specific actions that will be taken in revising the training package fall into five major categories. These actions do not, of course, stem entirely from this single pilot test but are actions that were suggested by earlier tests and have been reinforced in this third pilot.

   a. The package will be redesigned to be presented over a longer period of time, probably 3 full days rather than 2-1/2. The time for presentation has been a concern from the very beginning of this development. The problem has been to balance the time required to present the necessary material against the time that one could expect command and supervisory personnel to devote to training. The 2-1/2 day period seemed to provide just about enough time to present the material and yet not discourage command and supervisory personnel from attending. Also, the time would seem to allow for convenient use of a weekend if so desired and, by not fully scheduling the last day, it would be possible for participants to travel more conveniently in those locations where more extensive travel is required. However, the evidence from all three tests is quite clear that 2-1/2 days is simply not quite enough to accomplish what is intended. Along with extending the schedule into 3 full days, we plan to emphasize more strongly the desirability of conducting this training on a "live-in" basis. In both the Connecticut and the Traffic Institute tests, it was apparent that the time required for commuting caused a problem of scheduling and, in particular in both tests, the controlled drinking demonstration was compromised. A revision closely related to the required presentation time is concerned with alternative modes of presentation. The training package now includes a discussion of alternative presentation as through a community college or other training institution where a continuing and more intensive study of management requirements and obligations can be made. In going to a 3-day format, the material may be divided naturally into three major categories which might allow for the Workshop, itself, to be presented in three consecutive, perhaps weekly or monthly, sessions. These modes will be presented as alternatives. The basic mode remains the presentation, discussion and case study in three consecutive days.

   b. The final revision will include further guidance of a how-to-do-it nature. Specifically, there appears to be need for a concise outline in the Participant Manual that will allow each participant to follow the progress of the Workshop more easily. Also, there appears to be need for more information, both to the Leader and to the participant, about how to carry out the case study and the exercise, using the scenarios in Unit 2. In connection with this revision and related to one to be noted subsequently, the participants

(continued)

will be encouraged to prepare themselves with local material relevant to the Workshop and to have this for use in the case study and discussion.

c. The revision related to one just above is the reinforced recommendation that the Participant Manual be delivered to the participants prior to the Workshop and, along with that, some further instructions to the participants for their own study and preparation.

d. If it proves feasible, the final revision will include "solutions" to both the scenarios in Unit 2 and the case study. It has never been an objective of this training package to provide rote or dogmatic procedures for command and supervisory personnel. Rather, the objective has been to stimulate the participants into a development of, or at least the beginnings of, management actions specifically suited to their own needs and environment. It might appear that solutions for the material in this training package are offered as approved or recommended procedures. This appearance must be avoided, since there are no such routine procedures. Whether or not a full solution can be developed for each part of the case study and each scenario, a more detailed checklist for the use of the Workshop Leader will be provided.

e. The presentation of the basic studies, themselves, will be revised so that less time will be devoted to discussion of the factors and of the means by which they were determined, and more time and discussion will be devoted to the recommended management actions. This revision, along with the strong recommendations that the Participant Manual be distributed prior to the Workshop, will help keep an appropriate balance between the time devoted to the factors and the time devoted to management actions.

6. Revision of the training package along these lines is now under way. The completed package will be ready by the contract termination date.